

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:
DAVID A. CASIMIR
MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP
101 HOWARD STREET, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Applicant's or agent's file reference WICAB-09674 | | Date of mailing (day/month/year) 11 MAY 2005 |
| International application No. PCT/US04/35305 | | International filing date (day/month/year) 22 October 2004 (22.10.2004) |
| Priority date (day/month/year) 22 October 2003 (22.10.2003) | | FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below |
| International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): A61N 1/18 and US Cl.: 607/2 | | |
| Applicant BACH-Y-RITA, PAUL | | |

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230 | Authorized officer <i>Sharon L. Greene for</i> Jeffrey R. Jastrzab Telephone No. (571)272-4947 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US04/35305

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐ a sequence listing

☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐ in written format

☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐ contained in international application as filed.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US04/35305

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Novelty (N) | Claims <u>4, 6, 15, 17, 28, 30</u> | YES |
| | Claims <u>1-3, 5, 7-14, 16, 18-27, 29, 31-34</u> | NO |
| Inventive step (IS) | Claims <u>4, 15, 28</u> | YES |
| | Claims <u>1-3, 5-14, 16-27, 29-34</u> | NO |
| Industrial applicability (IA) | Claims <u>1-34</u> | YES |
| | Claims <u>NONE</u> | NO |

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-14, 16, 18-27, 29, 31-34 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by McConnell who teaches multiple implantable stimulators stimulate with vibratory (mechanical) as well as electrical stimulation.

Claims 6, 17 and 30 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over McConnell. McConnell teaches wireless transmission via induction but not light. Light transmission is a known functional equivalent to inductive communication in the implantable stimulator art and would have amounted to an obvious substitution of known functional equivalents.

Claims 4, 15 and 28 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest thermal tactile stimulation in an implantable device.

Claims 1-34 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.